DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 042 134 AC 008 517

TITLE	Report of Community Problems Survey Analyses.
INSTITUTION	South Carolina Univ., Columbia. Coll. of General Studies.
PUB DATE	70
NOTE	66p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.40
DESCRIPTORS	*Community Problems, *Community Service Programs, Community Size, Educational Needs, Geographic Regions, Housing, Program Proposals, Questionnaires, Recreation, Residential Patterns, *State Surveys, *University Extension, Youth Opportunities
IDENTIFIERS	Higher Education Act of 1965 (Title I), *South Carolina

ABSTRACT

During Fiscal Year 1968, the South Carolina State Implementing Agency for Title I (Higher Education Act of 1965) made a statewide survey of public officials, educators, and others as to the most pressing community problems. Responses came from 93 mayors or city clerks, 65 Economic Opportunity Board members, 66 state legislators, 102 school superintendents, 43 directors of Chambers of Commerce, 40 directors of planning commissions, and 52 participants in a Furman University seminar series. The survey questionnaire was structured to obtain a priority rating for ten categories of community problems. Efforts were also made to determine underlying causes and assign a priority rating to them. Perceived problems were analyzed by county, community size, and respondents' length of residence in South Carolina. Results gave housing, youth opportunity, education, and recreation as major felt needs, with poverty, land use, employment, health, government, and transportation as significant but lesser concerns. (Included are the questionnaire, five tables, the Fiscal Year 1971 amendment to the Title 1 state plan for community services and continuing education programs, and a summary of selected Federal programs having related concerns.) (LY)

ED042134

REPORT OF

COMMUNITY PROBLEMS SURVEY ANALYSES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

TITLE I

HIGHER EDUCATION ACT

OF

1965

STATE IMPLEMENTING AGENCY

COLLEGE OF GENERAL STUDIES

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

AC008517

COMMUNITY PROBLEMS SURVEY ANALYSES

INDEX

			Page
I.	Foreword		1
II.	Table of Priority Assigned Problem Areas by Occupational Groups Surveyed		2
III.	A.	Community Economic and Human Resources Development Services	
		1. Youth Opportunity	3
		2. Education	5
		3. Poverty	7
		4. Employment	8
	B.	Government and Community Development Services	
		1. Housing	11
		2. Government	12
		3. Transportation	15
		4. Land Use	16
	C.	Community Health and Recreation Services	
		1. Recreation	18
		2. Health	20
IV.	Survey Instrument		

FOREWORD

During FY 1968 the State Implementing Agency conducted a statewide survey entitled, "Identification of Community Problems in South Carolina," in an effort to identify the most pressing of Palmetto community problems.

This survey was sent to the following occupational groups:

Mayors and City Clerks

Members of the Economic Opportunity Board

State Legislators

School Superintendents

Directors of Chambers of Commerce

Directors of City and County Planning Commissions

Responses were received from 93 mayors or city clerks; 65 members of the Economic Opportunity Board; 66 State legislators; 102 school superintendents; 43 directors of Chambers of Commerce; 40 directors of Planning Commissions; and 52 participants in the Furman University seminar series, "Citizenship--Leadership Training for the 1980's." The questionnaire used was structured to obtain a priority rating (0 to 5) for community problems in ten areas--youth opportunity, education, poverty, employment, housing, government, transportation, land use, recreation, and health. In addition, an effort was made to determine the underlying causes of these problems and to assign a priority rating to them.

The returns were analyzed with a view toward obtaining comparisons and relationships of problems by region of the State, by counties, by large, medium-sized, and small cities of the State, and by length of respondent's residence within the State.

According to the survey, the major problem areas confronting the people of our State seem to be housing, youth opportunity, education, and recreation. Less significant problem areas identified, but still areas of concern, are poverty, land use, employment, health, government, and transportation.

Priority Community Problems

as ranked by

Seven Professional Groups in South Carolina

	Housing	Poverty	Government	Recreation	Employment	Youth Opportunity	Transportation	Health	Land Use	Education
Town Clerks	3	7	10	2	6	1	9	8	4	5
Economic Opportunity Board	3	1	8	4	5	2	9	7	10	6
Chamber of Commerce Directors	1	6	4	3	9	2	7	10	8	5
South Carolina Legislators	2	4	10	5	9	1	7	8	6	3
Planning Commission	1	6	7	4	9	2	8	10	5	3
School Superintendents	2	3	7	5	7	1	9	6	8	4
Furman	2	6	4	3	10	7	8	9	5	1

Scaled ranking by the seven major occupational groups of the ten problem areas identified in South Carolina. Replies to the survey were received from 461 of the 1,029 people canvassed, or 44.8% of the total. 36.8% of the town clerks responded, 56.5% of the members of the State's Economic Opportunity Board, 43.0% of the directors of Chambers of Commerce, 37.9% of the State legislators, 41.2% of the directors of City and County Planning Commissions, 51.0% of the school superintendents, and 59.8% of the participants in Furman University's FY 1967 Title I project, "Citizenship Leadership for the 1980's." In this table the number 1 signifies the problem area considered most critical by the respondent, the number 10, that the least pressing.

I. Community Economic and Human Resources Development Services

A. Youth Opportunity

Survey respondents, taken cumulatively, designated "Opportunities for Youth" as the second most serious problem challenging the State and its citizens.

Among the various professional groups participating in the survey, town clerks, State legislators and school superintendents accorded the problem top priority. Economic opportunity board members, chamber of commerce directors and planning commissioners assigned it the ranking it came to hold statewide. Participants in the Furman University workshops once again placed themselves outside the mainstream of thinking with their assessment that it holds a very modest seventh place in the order of priority that should be assinged the ten selected community problem areas.

With respect to the question of the principal causes of problems in the area of youth opportunity, members of the seven occupational groups arrived at one of their rare moments of consensus. While they may have structured the order of factors contributing to problems for youth opportunities in different fashions, they nevertheless did cite the same causative elements: lack of cultural training (given top priority by planning commission members and school superintendents), lack of social training (given top priority by economic opportunity board members), lack of vocational training (given top priority by State legislators), and lack of recreational facilities (given top priority by town clerks).

Residents of the State's Piedmont area assigned fourth place to youth opportunities in their priority list of community problems in South Carolina. Respondents from the Midlands and Pee Dee areas accorded it top priority. Those from the Tidewater region ranked it their third most serious problem.

Respondents from each region seemed to have their own ideas regarding the chief causes of the problem. Piedmont citizens regarded them as lack of counseling and guidance and lack of recreational facilities; Midlands citizens as lack of vocational training and lack of cultural training; Pee Dee citizens as lack of potential employment and lack of vocational training; and Tidewater citizens as lack of cultural training and lack of social training.

Respondents from the four major cities of the State, when asked to rank the enumerated problem areas in order of the problems each caused in the community, evaluated opportunities for youth in this manner:

Respondents from Columbia:	4th
Respondents from Charleston:	8th
Respondents from Greenville:	7th
Respondents from Spartanburg:	3rd

Columbians viewed the causes of problems for youth opportunities as stemming primarily from the prevalence of school drop-outs and a lack of social training. Columbia respondents were, additionally, the only ones who remarked to any appreciable degree the matter of juvenile delinquency. This they saw as the third greatest cause of problems in the area of youth opportunities.

The views of Charleston respondents on the causes of problems in this area were in accord with those reported above for respondents from the Tidewater region of the State. Similarly, those of Greenville respondents were the same as those held by respondents from the Piedmont region, also noted above.

Spartanburg respondents, contrary to the convictions of the majority of Piedmonters, saw the most serious problems for youth opportunities arising from a lack of vocational training and a lack of social training.

In checking the responses of people from towns in the range medium-sized to small, one soon notices that the smaller the community in which the respondent lives the higher priority he gives to the problem area of opportunities for youth. Thus, respondents from towns in the 7,000 - 8,000 population range regarded opportunities for youth as presenting the third most serious problem in their communities, while those from towns with populations between 6,000 and 7,000 ranked it second, and those from towns with populations between 1,000 and 4,000 ranked it first.

Replies from respondents resident in municipalities in the 7,000 - 8,000 and 6,000 - 7,000 population ranges indicate that they consider lack of cultural training and lack of social training to be the most significant reasons underlying the lack of opportunities for youth in their communities. Responses from those surveyed in the smaller towns of the State cite the lack of vocational training and the lack of potential employment.

In fifteen of South Carolina's forty-six counties survey respondents named opportunities for youth as the area of community life that most critically demands remedial action.

A number of factors were cited that, it was felt, contribute most directly to the deficiencies in this aspect of the community's life:

1) Abbeville County - Prevalence of school drop-outs

2) Allendale County - Lack of potential employment

3) Bamberg County - Lack of social training

4) Beaufort County - Lack of potential employment

5) Clarendon County - Lack of cultural training

6) Dorchester County - Lack of potential employment

7) Edgefield County - Lack of potential employment

8) Fairfield County - Lack of potential employment

9) Georgetown County - Lack of vocational training

10) Horry County - Lack of employment opportunities

11) Lee County - Lack of vocational training

12) Marlboro County - Lack of recreational facilities

13) Orangeburg County - Lack of cultural training

14) Union County - Lack of recreational facilities

15) Williamsburg County - Lack of potential employment

Responses analyzed by length of respondent's residence within the State reveal that the lengthier the period of residence the greater is the concern with the problem of youth opportunities in South Carolina.

Those resident in the State less than twenty years ranked opportunities for youth sixth in the order of priority among problems that need to be attacked by Palmetto citizens. Those resident in South Carolina for between twenty and forty years ranked it second, and those resident for between forty and fifty or more years accorded it top priority.

B. Education

There was a high consensus among all of the seven groups surveyed with respect to the prime educational needs in the State. Chief among these were listed a lack of adequate revenues for financing, the need for more vocational training, and the need for more adult education.

The Furman group, perhaps unconsciously evincing a certain eschewal of non-intellectual pursuits, was alone in its failure to see the importance of more vocational training. For them, a lack of adequate general public education was, however, a big thing, whereas, the rankings of the other groups, taken compositely, placed this alledged dificiency in sixth (out of a possible eight) place among the most serious causes of educational problems in South Carolina.

School superintendents who participated in the survey ranked the factors that give rise to the greatest problems in education in the following order:

(1) Lack of adequate revenues for financing.
(2) Need for more vocational training.
(3) Need for more adult education.
(4) No opportunities for higher education.
(5) Lack of planning.
(6) Lack of adequate public education.
(7) Poor curricula.
(8) Poor administration of schools.

There can be no question that public education in South Carolina is to a quite serious degree crippled by an insufficiency of funds. Salaries to attract the best teachers cannot be paid, educational programs directed to

the mentally and orthopedically handicapped are so limited that they reach only a fraction of the children in the State so disadvantaged. The list of limitations imposed on the educational system as a consequence of lack of adequate revenues could go on ad infinitum. To eliminate this revenue shortage will require an increase in taxes on either personal income or property. Whether the citizens of the State will be amenable to additional levies to ensure an improved program of public instruction is another question.

Vocational education programs and facilities are continually being expanded and improved. However, at this date they are inadequate. The programs have not been able to keep abreast of the demand for job skills in South Carolina's changing economy and employment conditions. The instruction given in vocational schools seems to be of a high order, but lacking is a broad offering of courses across the State. More staff is needed to function efficiently and effectively in all fields.

Adult education in South Carolina expanded its operations three years ago. In this period some 100,000 adult students have been enrolled. At this point perhaps the most pressing need is for research in adult education. This would necessitate the addition of well-qualified personnel to evaluate how South Carolina is meeting the crisis of its large under-educated population and to help determine trends and goals in the rapidly expanding adult education area.

A second important need is for a broader definition of adult education. It should not only include the basic and high school educational training, along with the vocational and technical training, but also provide continuing education which will be essential for South Carolinians at all levels in this rapidly-changing age. This broader definition will, of absolute necessity, demand a high degree of coordination between existing agencies and South Carolina's institutions of higher learning.

Length of residence within the State among survey respondents seems to evoke little divergence in their assessments of the factors causing the greatest problems in education. With the exception of those who have lived in South Carolina for a period of from 10-14 years and those resident for from 30-39 years, all other respondents with credentials of residency tenure ranging from 0-50 years agree that a lack of revenue is the foremost villain in the gallery of circumstances inimical to quality education. Even the dissidents rank it second. Other deficiencies consistently cited are a lack of planning, the need for more vocational training and for more adult education, a lack of adequate public education, and, in a few instances, poor curricula. Poor curricula is probably a very real factor in small secondary schools. Consolidation would do much to provide an effective remedy.

Those surveyed across the State were given a list of eight causes of educational problems and asked to assign a priority rating to them. In all of the State's forty-six counties save twelve the lack of adequate revenues for financing, the need for more vocational training, and the need for more adult education were selected (not necessarily always in this order) the top causes of problems. In the twelve counties in which all three did not appear in the front ranks, at least two of the three did.

Respondents from Abbeville, Allendale, Fairfield, and McCormick Counties noted particularly the lack of planning in the educational system and the poor administration of schools. Replies from Aiken County singled out poor administration of schools as the chief cause of that county's educational woes, while those from Newberry County cast lack of planning in that role. And these were the only two deficiencies that weren't cited at all by respondents from

Bamberg County.

In three of the four largest cities of the State--Columbia, Charleston, and Spartanburg--the need for more vocational training was deemed the outstanding educational need. This problem was not emphasized so greatly by respondents from Greenville, who saw lack of funds as the really critical issue.

Respondents from towns in the 7,000 - 8,000 population range cited lack of adequate revenues as the chief deterrent to a system of quality education. Those from South Carolina towns in the 6,000 - 7,000, 3,000 - 4,000, 2,000 - 3,000 and 1,000 - 2,000 population ranges also opted for the general favorite by selecting lack of adequate revenues and then went on in continued agreement to place in second, third, and fourth positions the need for more vocational training, the need for more adult education, and the lack of opportunities for higher education. The last named is indisputably a fact in the lives of residents of the State's small communities. Only one such community, out of the dozens extant, boasts an institution of higher learning --Due West with its Erskine College.

In summary, then, the principal educational needs in South Carolina, as adjudged by our survey respondents, are greater revenue for financing, more vocational training, more adult education, greater opportunities for higher education, better planning, and improved administration of schools.

C. Poverty

As with the community problem area of housing, treated below, in the area of poverty a very strong consensus was reached by survey respondents on the causal priority of community poverty problems. Lack of individual initiative, lack of counseling and guidance, lack of knowledge concerning government programs, lack of educational possibilities, and lack of employment opportunities were, in fact, virtually the only five (out of a possible nine) causes cited. Every occupational group, save the independent-minded members of the Economic Opportunity Board, placed the responsibility for economic deprivation first and foremost on the shoulder of the indigent himself. They saw his plight as a product of his own indolence.

Once again there was a wide divergence between the conservative faction (Town Clerks) and the actionists (Economic Opportunity Board members) in their assessment of the degree to which the stated causes bore on problems in the area of poverty. The latter group saw a high causal relationship between the problems associated with poverty and the various educational and employment deficiencies prevailing in their communities, while the town clerks seemingly felt that a healthy spurt of individual initiative on the part of the poverty-stricken would alone remedy the situation. And again, the other five groups struck a moderate stance in their assessments.

Reflecting the relative prosperity of the region, poverty as a problem area ranked only sixth in the composite ratings for the Piedmont. In the Midlands poverty was rated as the fourth most serious problem. In six of the fourteen counties comprising that region the median family income in 1960 was below $3,000. In all of these six counties over 50% of the families were strapped with incomes of less than $3,000, and in one, Calhoun, 68.2% of all families were so disadvantaged.

Since at least 47% of the families in each county of South Carolina's Pee Dee, and as high as 68% in three counties--Lee, Williamsburg, and Clarendon--had less than $3,000 annual income in 1960 it seems obvious that each of these eleven counties has more than its share of poverty.

Those surveyed in the Pee Dee area of the State ranked poverty third--behind opportunities for youth and housing--in their priority ratings of problem areas. Respondents from Clarendon, Lee, and Williamsburg Counties saw it as second only to youth opportunities. These three counties of the Pee Dee, together with the Piedmont's McCormick, were the only four counties of the State in 1960 with median family incomes of less than $2,000.

Respondents from the Tidewater region of the State clearly felt that the lack of individual initiative is primarily responsible for poverty in that area. Whatever its causes it abounds. In Allendale County, in 1960, 60.1% of all families had less than $3,000 annual income; in Colleton County, 57.9%; in Dorchester County, 49.6%; in Hampton County, 58.0%; and in Jasper County, 60.2%. In none of these counties do the median school years completed for persons twenty-five years old and over reach eight.

Residents of the area who were surveyed ranked poverty fourth--after housing, education, and youth opportunities--in the priorities of problem areas in the region. Obviously there is an interrelation between all four areas. A low-income family environment tends to retard the social and mental growth of young children. Children with a limited education and few job skills repeat the cycle of poverty.

The problem of poverty will not be solved by charity, welfare, or other palliatives. Rather, the Federal Government can provide resources but the initiative, the drive and the creative management will have to come from the communities themselves. How do we re-arouse the desire to care, to hope, to act? This question must be resolved to effect any solution to poverty in South Carolina, the problem area ranked fifth most serious statewide.

D. Employment

Survey returns from over the State assign seventh place to employment in the order of priority among the ten identified problem areas.

With the exception of the Furman group, each of the seven occupational groups surveyed cited lack of work opportunities for special groups: youth, the aged, the handicapped, and lack of retraining for the unemployed as factors posing the most serious problems in employment in South Carolina. For the Furman respondents these were second and third in importance after lack of an adequate labor force. Lack of employment opportunities was also frequently noted.

The Piedmont was the only area of the State from which responses came assigning a significant rating to the lack of an adequate labor force. This is understandable in view of the fact that industrially this is the most technologically oriented section of the State. Much of the Piedmont's industry demands a more sophisticated labor force than is generally available in South Carolina.

Lack of employment opportunities, one of the six causes listed as possible contributors to problems in employment, was ranked lowest of the six in the Piedmont. In the Pee Dee, on the other hand, it was considered the second most prominent factor associated with problems in employment. Respondents from the Midlands and the Tidewater selected lack of work opportunities for selected groups and lack of retraining for the unemployed as the factors generating the greatest problems in the area of employment.

Length of residence in the State had a discernable bearing on the judgment of respondents with respect to the question of the causes of community problems in the area of employment. Those who have lived in South Carolina less than ten years noted particularly the lack of an adequate labor force. For those who have lived in the State for ten years or more, and perhaps are more accustomed to making adjustments in their operations to the fact that the State does not possess a sophisticated labor force, this deficiency was scarcely noted. These respondents cited as major deterrents to an optimum employment situation in South Carolina lack of work opportunities for special groups, lack of retraining for the unemployed, and lack of employment opportunities.

Where respondents have emphasized lack of employment opportunities as a source of difficulty in the employment picture of their communities or have written it off as of little or no import, it is uncertain just what they understand by the phrase. Do they conceive it to describe a situation in which jobs, at all levels, are unavailable in sufficient number to give work to all who seek it; or do they refer only to a lack of attractive, challenging employment? By the same token, when they cite lack of an adequate labor force, do they have reference to sheer numbers or to a paucity of trained, skilled workers? It would seem that in both instances they have the latter condition in mind. However, then you examine the responses from counties such as Allendale, Fairfield,and Williamsburg. Here lack of employment opportunities was cited as the paramount problem. It was accorded the highest possible rating on our scale (5.00). Lack of an adequate labor force was adjudged a non-existent problem (0.00 on the scale). Surely none of these respondents realistically appraises their respective county's supply of skilled workers as adequate to meet significant industrial growth there. It seems therefore that they are simply attempting to convey this picture and nothing more: counties with little or no industry, but with no lack of manpower to do what work presently is available.

Conversely, respondents from Anderson, Greenville, and Greenwood Counties, which, by South Carolina standards, are heavily industrial, assigned priority among the factors militating against optimum employment conditions in their areas to the lack of an adequate labor force. Lack of employment opportunities was given a very low rating. Here the problem shows itself to be the need for retraining of a sizeable portion of the labor market to meet the needs of the job market.

Bamberg, Beaufort, Berkeley, and Chesterfield County residents who answered our survey all described an identical situation prevailing in their counties: a great need for retraining of the unemployed that is not being met, and a lack of employment opportunities, coupled with an adequate labor force.

In all but four or five counties the lack of work opportunities for such special groups as youth, the aged, and the handicapped was cited as the first or second most serious failure of the system. With 1,000,000 plus of the State's population under twenty years of age, close to 200,000 over sixty-five, and some 150,000 orthopedically or mentally handicapped the enormity of the task of dealing with the employmental problems of so sizeable a segment of the population is readily appreciated.

Residents of Columbia and Charleston saw the same problems: lack of retraining for the unemployed, lack of work opportunities for youth, the aged, and the handicapped, and lack of job market information. These are the first returns in which the last-named figures with any prominence.

Similarly, Greenville and Spartanburg citizens saw the same problems: lack of an adequate labor force, lack of work opportunities for youth, the aged, and the handicapped, and lack of retraining for the unemployed.

Residents of small and medium-sized towns in the State (population: 1,000 - 8,000) viewed identically the causes of employment problems, even to the extent of assigning the same order of priority to them. They cited as the prime concerns lack of work opportunities for youth, the aged, and the handicapped, followed by lack of retraining for the unemployed and lack of employment opportunities.

Education is the key to the future picture on the employment scene in South Carolina. We must upgrade and educate many persons who now border on the unemployable. With increased educational effort, many persons can be added to the productive labor force. A continual advancing of the general level of education and training of the people of South Carolina is essential to provide the reservoir of skills and talents needed to staff the higher paying industries which can then be attracted to South Carolina in the future.

There is a vast difference between training people just enough to get a job and training people adequately to qualify for higher paying jobs.

Most of the persons in the labor force have jobs of some kind. The economy of the State has done relatively well in providing jobs and incomes; fut the State is still well behind the nation as a whole in average per capita income. Further increases in income levels will come from better qualifying people for the better jobs that many are not now equipped to perform. At this stage of South Carolina's economic development, increased education and training efforts seem essential to the continued economic growth of the State.

II. Government and Community Development Services

A. Housing

An examination of the returns submitted by the seven occupational groups surveyed reveals a significant agreement among them on the question of the priority order that should be given to the causes of housing problems in South Carolina. A virtual unanimity was achieved in their assessments which ranked, respectively, as the major factors contributing to the State's problems in the field of housing, the prevalence of slums with their low-income tenants, a lack of proper planning, a lack of public housing facilities, and a lack of community renewal programs.

The questionnaire used in the survey was structured to obtain not only a priority rating of causality, but also to reflect the degree to which the various enumerated causes contributed to the existence and perpetuation of the problem. And while, as has been remarked, there was a consensus regarding the former, the latter generated a marked variance of response. Town clerks were quite conservative in their estimates. Perhaps as the most nearly permanent members of the municipal hierarchy they epitomize the local tendency toward the status quo. In contrast, members of the Economic Opportunity Board--perhaps motivated by their continuous confrontation with pressing needs--were strongly reactive in their group assessment, assigning to eight of the nine listed causes a higher relevance rating than that given by the town clerks to the factor they ranked as preeminent in producing housing problems. Maintaining a moderate view, the Chambers of Commerce directors, State legislators, school superintendents, members of Planning Commissions and of the Furman group arrived at almost the same assessment as the cumulative one for the seven groups.

The fact that there was an agreement regarding the priority of causality and a lack of agreement on the question of the degree of relevance of these contributory causes of the State's housing problems suggests that subjectivity or group bias was negligible in determining the former, but was a pronounced determinant in assessing the latter. Thus corroboration among these diverse groups establishes a significantly higher degree of validity for relative rather than absolute assessment of the problem.

Returns from the four regions of the State, two of which-- the Piedmont and Tidewater areas--ranked housing as the leading community problem in the State, reflect an assessment of problem causality in housing almost identical to that identified by the seven occupational groups. The same four causes were selected as paramount in connection with Palmetto housing problems. All four regions assigned a rather moderate degree of relevance to these causes. It is interesting that the same priority was given the causes of housing problems by respondents to the survey from the principal cities of the State and by those from the smallest towns. This should serve to dispel the accepted notion that the problems of urban areas with large concentrations of population are totally different from the problems of small urban communities. The problems are the same; the difference is in magnitude. It follows, then, that if the problems of the various-sized communities are similar, and the causal factors underlying them are judged by their respective local officials to be the same, programs of education for the solution of these problems designed for any community of the State should be adaptable for use in all communities.

A look at the four prime identified needs, chosen as such by those surveyed over the State, brings into sharp definition the major aspects of the housing problem in South Carolina. Examining the survey returns, one is presented with this mental picture: a State, most of its municipalities, although blighted by slums and handicapped by low-income tenants, have not formulated comprehensive and long-range programs of correction providing for low-rent public housing and community renewal.

South Carolina like all states has a problem of providing adequate housing for its citizens. The objective may be obtained only if the desirable existing areas are conserved or rehabilitated and the undesirable existing areas are redeveloped.

Where do we go from here? The findings on problems in the State's housing resulting from this demonstration research project will be valuable only if they result in the development of a comprehensive, coordinated and statewide system of continuing education and community development programs designed to assist in the solution of the need in this problem area by utilizing the resources of the colleges and universities of South Carolina.

Briefly analyzed, this then is the State's most critical problem area as viewed by the respondents of the statewide survey made by this office.

B. Government

Town Clerks, not surprisingly, cited insufficient revenue as the major governmental problem. The frustrations stemming from having to operate with inadequate funds were also seized upon by State legislators, and planning commission members (both of whom accorded this vexing situation top priority), and by chamber of commerce directors, and school superintendents (each of whom ranked the problem a close second to that to which they had given first priority).

The remaining two occupational groups surveyed, economic opportunity board members and participants in the Furman University workshops, again demonstrated their tendency to view matters differently. In the order of priority that should be given the factors that spawn the chief problems in the field of state, county, and local government the Furman group placed the matter of revenue procurement fifth; economic opportunity board members placed it seventh.

The lack of adequately trained government employees, while rather minimized as a significant factor by the other groups, was given a relatively high ranking on the scale by economic opportunity board members, planning commissioners, and the Furman group, while being pretty much ignored by the others.

Where a particular occupational group has what might be termed a vested interest in the problem area being spotlighted--whether education, poverty, or what, it tends to adopt the defensive ploy of playing down any causal factor that might reflect on its professional performance. Thus, we find in the present instance the town clerks rating "administrative structure" as the least relevant element in the question "which of the /nine/ following cause the greatest political /governmental/ problems in

your community?" The economic opportunity board members on the other hand, seemed to think an outmoded and cumbersome administrative structure was second only to a lack of planning in fostering inefficiency in government. Sharing this viewpoint, but even more strongly, was the Furman group, which assigned top priority to this matter.

Respondents from the Piedmont, the Midlands, and the Tidewater region cited the same factors, although not always according them the same priority, which in their judgment are principally responsible for problems in government: lack of planning, revenue procurement, and lack of a strong system of county government. Pee Dee residents pretty generally went along with this assessment, although they brought in another element to which they assigned a high priority: lack of public works programs. These people would undoubtedly like to see an increase in such programs, not only to enjoy the benefit of the facilities that would be constructed, but to give impetus to the economy of the area.

Those who have lived in the State less than five years see an overhauling of the administrative structure, and incidental thereto, a strengthening of the system of county government, as the first tasks to be undertaken in a program to increase the efficiency of government.

Those who have lived in South Carolina for more than five but less than ten years felt that a lack of planning and a lack of adequately trained government employees were the chief problems in government. For those whose residence in the state has extended for at least ten but less than fifteen years the main deficiencies in political administration lie in the lack of a strong system of county government and a lack of planning.

Those who have been Palmetto citizens for more than fifteen years cited as the most prominent failings the lack of adequate revenue, a lack of adequately trained government employees, and the configuration of the administrative structure.

Abbeville County, Dillon County, Kershaw County, Laurens County, and Saluda County respondents stated that a lack of adequately trained government employees was the chief source of mischief in governmental affairs in their communities. By contrast, respondents from Allendale, Bamberg, Edgefield and Fairfield Counties assigned a 0.00 grade ("no problem at all") to this factor.

Replies from Aiken and Orangeburg Counties were unique in that they failed to rank lack of sufficient revenue as one of the foremost causes of governmental problems in their areas. Whereas respondents from all other counties viewed this matter as serious enough to merit either first, second, or third place in the rating of problem area causes, those from these two counties assigned eighth place to it.

Laurens County respondents had selected as second only to the area of housing that of government as the one that caused the greatest problems in their community. Residents of this county, along with those of Abbeville, Aiken, Anderson, Dillon, Dorchester, and Saluda Counties were the only respondents who gave this problem area so high a priority. Statewide it ranked ninth (out of a possible ten).

It is interesting to contrast the answers respondents from these seven counties selected when asked to identify the factors that cause the greatest governmental problems in their communities.

Respondents from Aiken and Anderson Counties cited lack of planning and lack of a strong system of county government as the chief sources of problems. Aiken, the wealthiest of these counties, was alone in not assigning a high priority to the matter of revenue procurement. For Dillon and Dorchester County respondents--their two counties are the poorest of the seven--this concern was of great importance. Furthermore, Dillon County respondents were the only ones from all forty-six counties who cited lack of public welfare programs as a major cause of governmental problems. They ranked it fourth after lack of adequately trained government employees, difficulties surrounding revenue procurement, and lack of a strong system of county government.

Abbeville County and Laurens County respondents cited as a principal failure of government in their areas the fact of a lack of public health facilities--a factor unnoted by respondents from any of the other counties of the State.

Respondents from the four major cities of the State, when asked to rank the ten enumerated problem areas in order of the problems each caused in the community evaluated government in this manner:

Respondents from Spartanburg:	2nd
Respondents from Greenville:	3rd
Respondents from Charleston:	5th
Respondents from Columbia:	10th

Columbia and Charleston respondents viewed the causes of problems in government similarly. The most effective of these, think they, are the administrative structure of government, lack of a strong system of county government, revenue procurement, and lack of planning.

Greenville and Spartanburg respondents hold to the view that lack of a strong system of county government is the most serious weakness of government in their communities.

Other factors giving rise to problems in the area under examination are:

Greenville	Spartanburg
2. Administrative structure of government	2. Lack of planning
3. Lack of planning	3. Lack of adequately trained government employees
4. Lack of community renewal	4. Administrative structure of government

While respondents from towns over the State in the 7,000 - 8,000 population range regarded government as presenting the second most serious problem in their communities, those from towns with populations between

1,000 and 7,000 ranked it ninth. Revenue procurement, as might be expected, was singled out as the leading cause of problems in government in these small communities. Too many services to provide and too little revenue.

In summary, then, survey respondents felt that the chief causes of problems in government are to be found in a lack of planning and a lack of adequately trained government employees. These two factors of course, mesh. A lack of training could be attributed to an inability to plan effectively. Also, they cited the administrative structure of government and the lack of a strong system of county government. The latter may represent in their minds one aspect of the ineffective organizational pattern of the former. Finally, they cited the problem of revenue procurement. That more funds are needed to improve and expand governmental operations at all levels within the State cannot be denied.

C. Transportation

Based on survey returns from 65 members of the Economic Opportunity Board, 87 town clerks, 35 directors of chambers of commerce, and 55 State legislators, only a superficial analysis of the transportation problem in South Carolina can be made.

As a preface to succeeding remarks a comment upon the degree of response among participating groups seems proper. The strongest reaction to the eight categories of transportation problems was registered by members of the Economic Opportunity Board, whose average priority evaluation was 1.7. The lowest rating, 0.9, came from town clerks. Median to these was the 1.3 position held by both the State legislators and chamber of commerce directors. This range of response averages appears characteristic of the four surveyed groups. Oriented toward the more problem plagued sector of the populace, the E. O. Board reacted most strongly; whereas, the town clerks, representative of a local aversion to change, responded least strongly. Between these two extremes stand the chamber of commerce directors, dedicated to local growth and progress, and the State legislators, cognizant of a statewide pattern of needs and resources.

Highways and city streets represent the most immediate concern of our survey respondents, for these are the elements of the system that affect them most directly in their day to day living, and from the returns recieved it seems apparent that they regard the network as reasonably adequate. Statewide, transportation was tenth in the order of priority assigned the ten identified community problem areas.

Residents of the Piedmont and Midlands ranked transportation ninth, those of the Pee Dee tenth, and those of the Tidewater area viewed it as the seventh most pressing problem facing the State.

Citizens of the Piedmont and of the Midlands reported that the greatest problem they faced in connection with transportation was lack of adequate parking facilities. For the less urbanized Pee Dee this was not deemed a problem of much consequence. Poor connecting service was viewed as a chief cause of transportation problems in that area. Generally, however, inter-urban needs, such as a more extensive expressway system and better connecting service, seem less pressing. There may be a dual

reason for this appraisal. First, recent years have witnessed sizeable Federal and State expenditures upon superhighways, the benefits of which are now being enjoyed. During the same period, however, urban planning and financing have been grossly inadequate to meet intra-city transportation needs.

This deficiency in municipal transportation is a contributing factor to other problem areas. Mr. Joseph Winter, Director of Urban Renewal for the City of Columbia, states that owners of sub-standard housing in the metropolitan area of the capital city are hesitant to improve their property unless the municipal government installs adequate sidewalks and drainage facilities. Present resources for providing such improvements, however, are considered insufficient. Thus housing--revealed in this survey to be the State's number one problem is-- definitely linked with the most pressing needs in the area of transportation.

One other problem, cited by several of those surveyed, is that faced by small town and rural area residents who commute to larger cities for employment. No commercial transportation facilities are usually available to them, car pools--because of the location and hours of work--are difficult to form, and the expense of providing personal transportation may be prohibitive for the lower income groups. Investigation of this growing needs merits attention.

In summary, the 242 persons surveyed seem to feel that intra--rather than inter--urban transportation needs are of highest priority. These needs, furthermore, are directly linked with those in the housing area. Attention, therefore, should perhaps now be more strongly concentrated within the city.

D. Land Use

Survey respondents over the State, taken cumulatively, assigned sixth place to land use in the order of priority among the ten identified problem areas. Overall, they cited lack of proper planning as the chief source of problems in this area, followed by the need for beautification, lack of proper zoning, and poor annexation provisions.

Town Clerks were the only faction who didn't view the factors of a lack of proper planning and poor annexation provision as weighty. The Furman University group was alone in its failure to accord importance to the need for beautification.

Only respondents from the State's Piedmont region reflected an assessment of problem causality in land use almost identical to that identified by the composite tally of the seven occupational groups.

Residents of the Midlands who participated in the survey cited the same four factors, although not according them the same priority, which in their judgment are principally responsible for problems in land use : poor annexation provisions, lack of proper zoning, lack of proper planning, and the need for beautification.

Respondents from the Pee Dee designated the lack of economic development as the greatest cause of land use problems. This deficiency was considered the second principal cause of mischief by those from the Tidewater area, who also gave a somewhat high priority to the lack of renewal programs.

Columbia and Greenville citizens listed the lack of renewal programs as the fourth most serious cause of problems with respect to land use. Charlestonians gave it top priority.

Respondents from small and medium-sized towns in South Carolina with populations ranging from 1,000 to 8,000 were not greatly concerned by the lack of renewal programs in their communities. Rather, they consistently cited the need for beautification, the lack of proper planning, and the lack of proper zoning.

Length of respondents' residence in the State had no appreciable affect on their assessments of the needs of their communities with respect to land use. They selected, although not always in the same order, the need for proper planning and proper zoning, for beautification, and for more effective annexation provisions.

III. Community Health and Recreation Services

A. Recreation

In response to the question "Which of the following factors cause the greatest problems in recreation?" members of the seven occupational groups surveyed all cited lack of revenues to provide for recreational facilities as the chief source of problems. Thereafter, their assessments were characterized by divergency rather than unanimity.

Town Clerks remarked the limited land available for recreational facilities; none of the other six groups saw this factor as weighty. For them, for the most part, apart from inadequate revenues, the critical elements of the problem were seen to lie in a lack of planning for recreational facilities or a lack of recreational services for senior citizens. This latter was ranked sixth (out of a possible six) in order of importance as a contributing factor to the present state of recreation in South Carolina by town clerks and by members of planning commissions.

Respondents from all four areas of the State cited lack of revenues to provide for recreational facilities and lack of planning for recreational facilities as the principal factors in creating problems in recreation. A lack of recreational services for senior citizens was also seen as a serious problem.

Responses analyzed by length of respondent's residence within the State, whether it be for less than a year or over fifty years, revealed but slight variations in the bearing that the various suggested causal factors were thought to have on the question of problems in recreation. In all cases greatest weight was placed on the lack of revenues to provide for recreational facilities.

One trend was noticeable. As the length of time of the respondent's residence in the State increased, the priority established by him for the factor "lack of services for senior citizens" became higher. Thus, for those resident in South Carolina 0 - 4 years and 5 - 9 years this deficiency was ranked as least important of the six constituent elements of the problem. By those who have lived here 15 - 19 years and 20 - 24 years it was ranked third. Those living in the State 40 - 49 years and 50 years or more viewed the matter as the second most serious aspect of the problem.

Those newest to the State purported to find a general apathy among the people in support of recreational activities.

Respondents from a dozen counties--Abbeville, Bamberg, Charleston, Colleton, Edgefield, Florence, Georgetown, Greenwood, Orangeburg, Pickens, Saluda, and Williamsburg--also noted this strongly.

A lack of recreational services for senior citizens was prominently cited by respondents from a number of counties, particularly by those from poorer counties, such as Abbeville, Allendale, Bamberg, Barnwell, Berkeley, Cherokee, Clarendon, Colleton, Dillon, Laurens, Marlboro, McCormick, Oconee, Orangeburg, Saluda, and Union.

Respondents from Bamberg, Pickens, and Saluda Counties viewed the lack of trained recreational personnel as the one condition that first must be corrected in order to effect a desireable recreational program in their communities and in the State as a whole. Respondents from Barnwell, Beaufort, Dorchester, Georgetown, Kershaw, Richland, and Spartanburg Counties also accorded a high priority to this problem.

Respondents from the four principal cities of the State--Columbia, Charleston, Greenville and Spartanburg--cited lack of revenues as the chief cause of inadequacies in the recreational picture in South Carolina. Thereafter, Charleston and Spartanburg respondents cited limited land for recreational facilities, Columbia respondents the lack of trained recreational personnel, Greenville residents lack of planning for recreational facilities.

While respondents from all of the smaller towns (population: 1,000 - 8,000) in the State gave priority to the need for additional revenues to provide for recreational facilities, the lack of services for senior citizens came more and more to the forefront the smaller the community from which the respondent came.

In summary, then, the respondents generally rated lack of revenues to provide for recreational services, lack of planning for recreational facilities and lack of recreational services for senior citizens as the most serious deficiencies in the recreational picture in South Carolina.

If parks and recreation facilities are to be provided for the residents of South Carolina, provisions must be made to finance adequately these improvements. Sufficient funds are not always available since the state and local levels of government have numerous duties and functions to perform which usually take precedence over recreation needs. Since our State and especially our local levels of government are hard pressed for adequate revenues, it will be necessary to find additional sources of revenue if more parks and recreation facilities are to be provided.

The State Legislature each year appropriates funds to several State agencies to provide outdoor recreation facilities; however, additional monies are going to be required to make needed improvements in the immediate future. As a first step the State agencies should request sufficient additional appropriations from the General Assembly to provide a high level of service. This places a major responsibility on the State agencies to show the importance of necessary additions and improvements. The success or failure of outdoor recreation planning will, in large part, be determined by its relationship to comprehensive planning at all levels of government. Only when the quantity, quality and location of recreation developments are planned and developed in harmony with other physical facilities, such as residences, schools, highways and places of work, can recreation be most beneficial to the user. For those communities which do not have full-time planning staffs, the services of the Community Planning Division of the South Carolina Development Board are available. To assist local communities with planning problems specifically involving recreation, the services of the South Carolina Recreation Commission staff are also available.

South Carolina's residents aged 65 and over, her mentally retarded and her physically handicapped, together, represent more than one-fifth of the State's population. Although most of these people will seek recreation at public areas along with the general population, many will require special recreation facilities. Also to be borne in mind is that facilities at regular recreation areas should be designed and equipped to accommodate better the needs of the aged and the handicapped. Among the special design elements to be considered are the following: (1) ramps should be used instead of steps when possible; when steps must be used sturdy handrails should be provided; (2) facilities likely to be used by the aged and the handicapped should be located near parking areas; and (3) all buildings and furnishings should be designed so as to facilitate use by the aged and the handicapped. In addition, studies of the special recreational requirements of the aged and the handicapped should be undertaken.

B. Health

Health problems were generally not viewed by survey respondents as being particularly significant, and this despite the fact that the people of South Carolina now have the lowest average life expectancy at birth in the United States.

Two groups, the Chamber of Commerce directors and the members of city and county Planning Commissions, ranked the general problem area tenth out of a possible ten. School superintendents and Economic Opportunity Board members, who perhaps have more exposure to that segment of the community's populace for whom standards of hygiene and health are not so high, were somewhat less optimistic in their assessment of the problem. The superintendents ranked health problems sixth in importance, the O.E.O. staffers, seventh. A cumulative assessment for the State as a whole placed health eighth in rank among the problems with which the citizenry contend.

Respondents from the majority of the seven professional groups surveyed cited the lack of hospital and health facilities and personnel as the greatest problem in the area of health in South Carolina. The only marked dissent to this judgment came from Planning Commission members who ranked this concern sixth (out of a possible ten). Other causes of health problems in the State particularly noted were a lack of public health programs, a lack of aid to the permanently and totally disabled, health problems of the aged, and a lack of renewal programs.

For those surveyed who have lived in South Carolina less than five years a significantly different order of priorities obtains. They view as the principal health problems a lack of renewal programs, air pollution, water pollution, and a lack of public health programs. They no doubt represent a younger mentality who have not had to be so much concerned with the inadequacy in number of beds and personnel in hospitals and other health facilities or such matters as the care of the disabled or the aged. Others who have lived in the state for five or more years quite generally find agreement among themselves on the priorities enumerated in the beginning of this report.

Respondents from small and poor counties with static populations consistently cited the same deficiencies in the field of health in their communities: lack of hospital and health facilities and personnel, lack of renewal programs, lack of aid to the permanently and totally disabled, and lack of public health programs. Also noted were the problem of treatment of chronic diseases and the health problems of the aged.

With small revenues, these counties are limited in what they can do in carrying out various health programs and constructing health facilities. But even in the more prosperous counties facilities, personnel, and programs are inadequate. Georgetown County residents were alone in placing lack of hospital and health facilities and personnel at the bottom of their priority rating of health problems. In a majority of counties this figured as the foremost problem. Of course, the town of Georgetown does have one of the finest general hospitals in the southeast. Georgetown citizens, like Charlestonians, placed heavy emphasis on the hazards of air pollution and water pollution. Obviously their concern with the menace of water pollution is understandable. So too is it with air pollution if you have ever driven through either community.

Respondents from Spartanburg and York Counties cited air pollution as a particularly grave concern. This too is understandable in view of the unenviable rating for total suspended particulates in these locations. Both Spartanburg and Rock Hill, the chief population centers of these counties, experienced a twenty percent population growth during the period from 1955 to 1965. Population growth, along with the associated industrial and commercial growth, generally leads to higher air pollution levels unless adequate control measures are taken. Both cities are highly industrialized, with manufacturing responsible for approximately 75% of the total employment in Rock Hill. In Spartanburg the frequency of reduced visibility is one apparent indication of air pollution.

Respondents from Columbia listed personal services as the area of most needed improvement in the local health picture. They noted the need for additional hospital and health facilities and personnel, for more assistance to the permanently and totally disabled, and for a more concerted attack on chronic diseases and on the health problems of the aged.

Greenville's citizens cited the same needs, but topmost priority was given by them to another need--renewal programs.

Lack of such programs, together with water pollution and air pollution, were considered by Charlestonians the greatest obstacles to community advancements in health.

Respondents from the city of Spartanburg selected as the chief causes of their health problems air pollution, lack of hospitals and other health facilities, lack of renewal programs and water pollution.

Replies from those surveyed in towns in the 6,000 - 8,000 population range reveal a feeling that no particularly serious health problems exist in these communities. Air pollution was deemed negligible. The number of hospital and health facilities and personnel were regarded as fairly adequate. A band of about thirty from this group did feel that the lack of renewal programs posed a somewhat grave problem to high community health standards.

Again, those living in the smaller towns of the State (population: 1,000 to 4,000) professed by their responses to see no serious health problems. What problems these communities do face in this area seemingly center around the lack of hospital and health facilities and personnel and the lack of aid to the permanently and totally disabled.

IDENTIFICATION OF COMMUNITY PROBLEMS IN SOUTH CAROLINA

DATE_____

_____ _____

CITY COUNTY

Personal Data on Interviewee:

Name_____

Position and Occupation_____

Length of Residence in Community:_____ yrs._____ mos._____

Length of Residence in State:_____ yrs._____ Mos._____

Grade the following: 0 will represent no problem and 5 will represent a great problem with intermediate numbers representing intermediate degrees of the problem.

I. Which of the following present the greatest problems in your community?

_____ A. Housing
_____ B. Poverty
_____ C. Politics or Government
_____ D. Recreation
_____ E. Employment
_____ F. Opportunities for Youth
_____ G. Transportation
_____ H. Health
_____ I. Land Use
_____ J. Education
_____ K. Other Specify_____

II. Which of the following cause the greatest housing problems in your community?

_____ A. Lack of Proper Planning
_____ B. Lack of Proper Housing Codes
_____ C. Local Tax Policy
_____ D. Slums and Low Income Tenants
_____ E. Lack of a Community Renewal Program
_____ F. Lack of Public Housing Facilities
_____ G. Inequality in Housing Facilities
_____ H. Lack of Housing for Senior Citizens
_____ I. Plumbing deficiencies
_____ J. Other Specify_____

Could these problems be resolved by:

Better education? Yes_____ No_____
Better public administration? Yes_____ No_____
Others? Specify_____

What agency in your community could be beneficial in solving these problems?_____

Does your community need additional help from any other agency?
Yes_____ No_____

What agency?_____

III. Which of the following cause the greatest problem with poverty in your community?

_____ A. Lack of Adequate Distribution of Commodities
_____ B. Lack of Aid to Families with Dependent Children
_____ C. Lack of Legal Assistance
_____ D. Lack of Employment Opportunities
_____ E. Lack of Counseling and Guidance
_____ F. Lack of Educational Possibilities
_____ G. Lack of Individual Initiative
_____ H. Lack of Knowledge Concerning Government Programs
_____ I. Other Specify_____

Could these problems be resolved by:

Better Education? Yes_____ No_____
Better public administration? Yes_____ No_____
Others? Specify_____

What agency in your community could be beneficial in solving these problems?_____

Does your community need additional help from any other agency?
Yes_____ No_____

What agency?_____

IV. Which of the following cause the greatest political problems in your community?

_____ A. Lack of Public Works Programs
_____ B. Lack of Community Renewal
_____ C. Administrative Structure
_____ D. Revenue Procurement
_____ E. Lack of Planning
_____ F. Lack of Public Health Facilities
_____ G. Lack of Public Welfare Programs
_____ H. Lack of Adequately Trained Government Employees
_____ I. Lack of Strong System of County Government
_____ J. Other Specify_____

Could these political problems be resolved by:

Better education? Yes_____ No_____
Better public administration? Yes_____ No_____
Better community leadership? Yes_____ No_____
Others? Specify_____

What agency in your community could be beneficial in solving these problems?_____

Does your community need additional help from any other agency?
Yes_____ No_____

What agency? _____

V. Which of the following cause the greatest problems in recreation?

_____ A. Limited Land for Recreational Facilities
_____ B. Lack of Revenues to Provide for Recreational Facilities
_____ C. Lack of Planning for Recreational Facilities
_____ D. Lack of Public Support of Recreational Activities
_____ E. Lack of Trained Recreational Personnel
_____ F. Services for Senior Citizens
_____ G. Other Specify_____

What agency in your community could be beneficial in solving these problems?_____

Does your community need additional help from any other agency?
Yes_____ No_____

What agency?_____

VI. Which of the following cause the greatest problems in employment?

_____ A. Lack of Adequate Labor Force
_____ B. Lack of Employment Opportunities
_____ C. Lack of Retraining for Unemployed
_____ D. Lack of Equal Employment Opportunities
_____ E. Lack of Work Opportunities for Special Groups: Youth, the Aged, the Handicapped
_____ F. Lack of Job Market Information
_____ G. Other Specify_____

Could these problems in employment be resolved by:

Better education? Yes_____ No_____
Better public administration? Yes_____ No_____
Better community leadership? Yes_____ No_____
Others? Specify_____

What agency in your community could be beneficial in solving these problems? _____

Does your community need additional help from any other agency?
Yes_____ No_____

What agency?_____

VII. Which of the following cause the greatest problems for youth opportunities?

_____ A. Lack of Educational Opportunities
_____ B. Lack of Potential Employment
_____ C. Lack of Counseling and Guidance
_____ D. Prevalent Juvenile Delinquency
_____ E. Lack of Recreational Facilities
_____ F. Lack of Social Training
_____ G. Lack of Vocational Training
_____ H. Lack of Cultural Training
_____ I. Prevalence of School Drop-outs
_____ J. Other Specify_____

Could these problems in youth opportunity be resolved by:

Better education? Yes_____ No_____
Better public administration? Yes_____ No_____
Better community leadership? Yes_____ No_____

What agency in your community could be beneficial in solving these problems?

Does your community need additional help from any other agency?
Yes_____ No_____

What agency?

VIII. Which of the following cause the greatest transportation problems?

_____ A. Lack of Adequate Public Transportation
_____ B. Lack of Rapid Transit Facilities
_____ C. Lack of Expressway System
_____ D. Lack of Accessibility to other Areas and Regions
_____ F. Lack of Adequate Parking Facilities
_____ G. Poor Connecting Service
_____ H. Lack of Sidewalks and Drainage Facilities
_____ I. Other Specify_____

Could these problems of transportation be resolved by:

Better education? Yes_____ No_____
Better public administration? Yes_____ No_____
Better community leadership? Yes_____ No_____
Others? Specify_____

What agency in your community could be beneficial in solving these problems? _____

Does your community need additional help from any other agency?
Yes_____ No_____

What agency? _____

IX. Which of the following cause the greatest health problems?

_____ A. Lack of Renewal Program
_____ B. Lack of Public Health Programs
_____ C. Air Pollution
_____ D. Water Pollution
_____ E. Lack of Adequate Welfare Programs
_____ F. Lack of Adequate Immunization Programs
_____ G. Lack of Hospital and Health Facilities and Personnel

_____ H. Chronic Diseases and Health Problems of the Aged
_____ I. Lack of Aid to Permanently and Totally Disabled
_____ J. Deficiency of Crippled Children Services
_____ K. Other Specify_____

Could these health problems be resolved by:

Better education? Yes_____ No_____
Better public administration? Yes_____ No_____
Better community leadership? Yes_____ No_____
Others? Specify _____

What agency in your community could be beneficial in solving these problems? _____

Does your community need additional help from any other agency?
Yes_____ No_____

X. Which of the following cause the greatest land use problems:

_____ A. Lack of Conservation Programs
_____ B. Lack of Renewal Programs
_____ C. Lack of Proper Planning
_____ D. Lack of Economic Development
_____ E. Poor Annexation Provisions
_____ F. Lack of Proper Zoning
_____ G. Need for Beautification
_____ H. Other Specify_____

Could these land use problems be resolved by:

Better education? Yes_____ No_____
Better public administration? Yes_____ No_____
Better community leadership? Yes_____ No_____
Others? Specify_____

What agency in your community could be beneficial in solving these problems? _____

Does your community need additional help from any other agency?
Yes_____ No_____

What agency? _____

XI. Which of the following cause the greatest problems in education?

_____ A. Lack of Adequate Public Education
_____ B. Lack of Planning
_____ C. Lack of Adequate Revenues for Financing
_____ D. Poor Curricula
_____ E. Poor Administration of Schools
_____ F. Need for More Vocational Training
_____ G. No opportunities for Higher Education
_____ H. Need for More Adult Education
_____ I. Other Specify_____

Could these problems in education be resolved by:

Better education? Yes_____ No_____
Better public administration? Yes_____ No_____
Better community leadership? Yes_____ No_____
Others? Specify_____

XII. What are the causes of other problems that exist in the community?

XIII. Do you think that extension courses offered for the adult population could be of value to your community? Yes_____ No_____

Do you think that vocational training of your labor force could be of value in getting industry to locate in your community?
Yes_____ No_____

Additional comments and/or personal observations:

Table I

Priority Community Problems
as ranked by
Seven Professional Groups in South Carolina

	Housing	Poverty	Government	Recreation	Employment	Youth Opportunity	Transportation	Health	Land Use	Education
Town Clerks	3	7	10	2	6	1	9	8	4	5
Economic Opportunity Board	3	1	8	4	5	2	9	7	10	6
Chamber of Commerce Directors	1	6	4	3	9	2	7	10	8	5
South Carolina Legislators	2	4	10	5	9	1	7	8	6	3
Planning Commission	1	6	7	4	9	2	8	10	5	3
School Superintendents	2	3	7	5	7	1	9	6	8	4
Furman	2	6	4	3	10	7	8	9	5	1

Scaled ranking by the seven major occupational groups of the ten problem areas identified in South Carolina. Replies to the survey were received from 461 of the 1,029 people canvassed, or 44.8% of the total. 36.8% of the town clerks responded, 56.5% of the members of the State's Economic Opportunity Board, 43.0% of the directors of Chambers of Commerce, 37.9% of the State legislators, 41.2% of the directors of City and County Planning Commissions, 51.0% of the school superintendents, and 59.8% of the participants in Furman University's FY 1967 Title I project, "Citizenship Leadership for the 1980's." In this table, and in those that follow, 1 signifies the problem area considered most critical by the respondent, the number 10, that the least pressing.

Priority Community Problems

in

The Four Regions of South Carolina

Table II

	Housing	Poverty	Government	Recreation	Employment	Youth Opportunity	Transportation	Health	Land Use	Education
Piedmont	1	6	7	2	10	4	9	8	5	3
Midlands	2	4	10	3	7	1	9	6	8	5
Pee Dee	2	3	9	4	5	1	10	7	8	6
Tidewater	1	4	6	8	9	3	7	10	5	2
Entire State	1	5	9	4	7	2	10	8	6	3

Order of priority assigned community problem areas by survey respondents resident in each of the four regions of the State, together with an assigned priority for the State as a whole. 145 replies were received from the Piedmont area of the State, 125 from the Midlands, 86 from the Pee Dee, and 41 from the Tidewater area.

Priority Community Problems
in
The Large Towns of South Carolina

Table III

	Housing	Poverty	Government	Recreation	Employment	Youth Opportunity	Transportation	Health	Land Use	Education
Columbia	1	2	10	3	9	4	8	6	7	5
Charleston	2	3	5	7	9	8	6	7	4	1
Greenville	2	5	3	4	10	7	9	8	6	1
Spartanburg	1	2	2	3	7	3	5	7	4	6

Scale of significance of problem areas given by survey respondents living in the four principal cities of South Carolina. 35 replies were received from Columbia, 12 from Charleston, 55 from Greenville, and 7 from Spartanburg.

Priority Community Problems

in

The Medium-sized Towns of South Carolina

Table IV

	Housing	Poverty	Government	Recreation	Employment	Youth Opportunity	Transportation	Health	Land Use	Education
7,000-8,000 Population	1	5	2	4	9	3	6	7	8	3
6,000-7,000 Population	1	3	9	3	5	2	7	6	8	4

Evaluative ranking of identified problem areas by survey respondents living in medium-sized towns in South Carolina. 17 replies were received from towns in the 7,000 to 8,000 population range and 37 from those in the 6,000 to 7,000 population range.

Priority Community Problems
in
The Small Towns of South Carolina

Table V

	Housing	Poverty	Government	Recreation	Employment	Youth Opportunity	Transportation	Health	Land Use	Education
3,000-4,000 Population	2	3	9	6	5	1	10	7	8	4
2,000-3,000 Population	1	4	9	6	7	2	10	7	5	3
1,000-2,000 Population	3	6	8	2	5	1	9	7	10	4

Order of priority relegated to community problem areas by survey respondents from small towns in South Carolina. 30 replies were received from towns in the 3,000 to 4,000 population range, 37 from those in the 2,000 to 3,000 range, and 37 from those in the 1,000 to 2,000 population range.

TITLE I, HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

Annual Amendment

to

South Carolina State Plan for Community Service
and Continuing Education Programs

for

FISCAL YEAR 1971

Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 has been in existence in South Carolina since May of 1966. It is a federal-state effort to employ the expertise and facilities of higher education in programs of continuing education and community service designed to assist in the solution of community problems. Hopefully the seed money provided through this Act will serve to strenghten the institutional capacity and interest of South Carolina colleges and universities in community service programs.

Twenty-two South Carolina colleges, four junior colleges, and the state's two accredited technical education centers meet the eligibility requirements delineated in the Act. During the past three years, eleven of these institutions have submitted proposals and have been awarded grants. These include:

Benedict College
Clemson University
Coker College
College of Charleston
Columbia College
Converse College
Furman University
South Carolina State College
University of South Carolina
Voorhees College
Winthrop College

Most other South Carolina institutions have evinced an interest in Title I either through the actions of individual staff members seeking general information about the Act or discussing with the Title I Coordinator the suitability vis-a-vis the Act and programs they had under consideration.

The Title I Agency considers that modest success has been achieved in developing lines of communication between the State's institutions of higher learning and itself and in promoting involvement by South Carolina institutions in community service programs.

AD 28517

It is anticipated that a number of institutions in the State will continue to experience difficulty in providing the 33 1/3% match required for funding FY 1971 programs. This factor, however, should not deter institutional representation from discussing proposal ideas with a representative from the Title I office. It is possible that an arrangement in joint funding between several institutions can be worked out or funding from other sources developed.

Because the State will continue to rely heavily on its colleges and universities as a main resource for community service and continuing education programs which affect systems in education, government, health and welfare and for programs which attack problems of poverty, housing, youth opportunity, race, and the quality of life in the cities and towns of the State all institutions of higher education are encouraged to contribute as fully as possible to the solution of community problems through community service and continuing education programs. To this end an effort will be made to encourage creative program efforts in a broad range of problem areas.

In order to utilize to the maximum the resources present in our colleges and universities in alleviating the numerous problems facing the State the South Carolina Budget and Control Board as administering agency and the Advisory Council appointed by the Governor believe that the Title I system in the State must be flexible and enabling. The institutions of higher education support this approach.

Therefore, in fiscal year 1971 the State Agency plans to continue its efforts toward developing programs related to the following categories:

I. Community Economic and Human Resources Development Services

- A. Youth Opportunity
- B. Education
- C. Poverty
- D. Employment

II. Government and Community Development Services

- A. Housing
- B. Government
- C. Transportation
- D. Environmental Quality

III. Community Health and Recreation Services

- A. Recreation
- B. Health

The above categories were established by the State Agency on June 2, 1967, and reaffirmed on June 10, 1968 and on May 27, 1970 with the altering of the priority land use to include all ecological and environmental activities under the heading Environmental Quality. These

priorities were decided upon after consultation with representative community leaders and organizations and with representatives of higher education and government.

In preparing this year's amendment the Agency has also been guided by the 1968 statewide sampling survey of mayors, State legislators, school superintendents, directors of Chambers of Commerce, directors of City and County Planning Commissions and the members of the Economic Opportunity Board. This survey directed toward the identification of priority community problems in South Carolina continues to provide the Agency with useful information and a broad base for decision making, both from the standpoint of the grass roots saturation achieved in the sampling and the wide spectrum of expertise placed at the Agency's disposal by virture of professional interests surveyed.

Further research was made through a study of the report, "Opportunity and Growth in South Carolina, 1968-1985," popularly known as "The Moody Report." The report is a study of the bonding capacity of South Carolina and of new programs in the areas of education, health, transportation, and tourism and recreation supportable by that bonding capacity that would stimulate the State's economic growth and enhance the opportunities of its citizens.

Moody Investors Services, Inc., of New York City and Campus Facilities Associates, of Boulder, Colorado, undertook the study. The results were reported in "Opportunity and Growth in South Carolina, 1968-1985," a study of more than 300 pages publicly released by Governor Robert E. McNair on July 31, 1968. The recommendations of the report with respect to the above listed areas served as the basis of the Governor's legislative program for fiscal 1970 and will continue as the prime source of proposals to the legislature in fiscal 1971.

In developing this FY 1971 Amendment due consideration was given to the existence of other federally financed programs dealing with similar and other community problems, and to the resources of institutions of higher education that are existent for the development and operation of community service programs related to specific aspects of the selected community problems.

The specific aspects of the comprehensive, coordinated and statewide system of community service and continuing education programs for which financial assistance is requested for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971 are:

I. Community Economic and Human Resources Development Services

A. Youth Opportunity

In South Carolina the area of youth opportunity needs programs of community service and continuing education to help solve its problems. This State ranks fourth in

the proportion of its population that is of school age, 29 percent being between the ages of 5 and 17. In comparing the age groups (5-17) with the productive adult population (21-64), we stand third in the nation, with 63 school children per 100 adults as against a national average of 49 per 100 adults. The median age of the Palmetto citizenry is 23.4, 6.1 years less than the national median. Unfortunately, a high percentage of these youth--75.82 percent of the Negro and 51.46 percent of the white--become school drop-outs, and 55.6 percent of our young men fail the Selective Service Mental Test. Examples of possible Title I projects are as follows:

1. Conducting regional instructional programs for adult community leaders in principles of youth development.

2. Establishing student service corps to furnish needed manpower to community service groups.

3. Holding courses for teachers and community leaders in planning and presenting programs of social self-improvement for culturally deprived youth and thus eliminate a serious handicap to their success.

4. Providing interested citizens with training in presenting enrichment programs especially adapted to the needs of youth from low-income families.

5. Offering a summer institute to guidance counselors, teachers, parents, and community leaders stressing the requirements and opportunities of the non-college bound.

6. Creating a bureau to advise and aid students in the founding of youth industries.

7. Holding a series of seminars for parents, teachers, and other adults to assist them in identifying at early ages and referring for professional care children who suffer borderline or significant physical or mental handicaps.

8. Conducting a comprehensive educational program aimed at forming permanent community groups to sponsor youth activities and delinquency prevention.

B. Education

Even though a major portion of the Palmetto State's revenue is spent on education, certain grave deficiencies still characterize this area. Almost 231,000 adult South Carolinians have had four years or less of formal education. Of these, 51,584 have never been to school. With an average of only 8.7 school years completed by persons 25 and older, this State ranks 50th in the nation. Examples of possible Title I projects are as follows:

1. Preparing a series of audio-visual aids to help administrators, parents, and community leaders in developing a quality pre-school program throughout the State.

2. Developing short courses, conferences, and seminars to appraise professional groups of the latest theories and advanced practices in their respective field.

3. Assisting professional and technical societies and associations develop in-service training programs.

4. Developing interdisciplinary programs to assist groups or organizations with problems which require expertise from a variety of professional and technical sources.

5. Providing orientation and continuing education programs for teachers and auxiliary personnel to develop understanding of the problems of training the economically disadvantaged, discover effective means to solve these problems, and develop a system of interaction between the teaching group and other related service persons.

6. Development of a program to train mature adults as aids to professional teachers to meet the growing and expanding need for auxiliary school personnel.

7. Training school board members to formulate and enforce adequate policies and procedures relating to their official duties.

8. Beginning programs to assist teachers in understanding the culture, history and environment of Negroes as these relate to the problems of Negro school children.

C. Poverty

Although South Carolina is experiencing a substantial yearly increase in per capita income, we still rank 48th in the nation with an average citizen earning $1,828. The really handsome salaries earned by many South Carolinians are offset by a relatively dense concentration of low socio-economic groups. It is this composition of population that is reflected in wage statistics. Contributing causes of this large wage-differential are the high rate of school drop-outs, dependence of many families upon welfare, and personal incapacities. Examples of possible Title I projects are as follows:

1. Holding seminars to acquaint teachers, parents and community leaders with methods to combat school drop-outs.

2. Providing training and assistance programs to transform welfare families into independent and self-sustaining units.

3. Founding institutes to aid the elderly, the young, and the disabled to find suitable vocations or part-time work.

4. Establishing community service seminars and counseling programs to guide local leaders in reducing the impact of poverty on the community.

5. Beginning programs to encourage family planning, especially among low socio-economic groups.

6. Having study groups consisting of leaders from industry, education, and government to consider the efficacy of a program of accelerated promotions and in-service training to create more job opportunities at the lowest level of skill.

7. Founding self-help projects that would recruit and train indigenous sub-professionals from poverty strickenneighborhoods, provide an opportunity for low-income persons to meet and combine ideas for promoting general neighborhood welfare, and create a force that could launch other related programs such as buying clubs, co-ops, and self-help housing.

8. Conducting continued education services for social welfare agency personnel in the form of consultation services, workshops, and seminars for varying periods of time to upgrade the level of community social services in order that the agency's own programs of in-service training can be strengthened.

9. Training individuals who wish to work in welfare services but who do not qualify for professional jobs.

10. Holding a conference to bring together attorneys, representatives of the public, and private organizations of citizens to re-evaluate the legal services available to the poor in South Carolina.

D. Employment

The recent efforts of South Carolina to locate attractive industries have been highly successful. Opportunities for skilled labor in this State are indeed enviable. Our employment problem, however, lies in a different direction: although our supply of unskilled workers is mounting, the demand for them is static. Furthermore, agricultural jobs have for the past twenty years been decreasing rapidly. Briefly stated then, the problem is this: our labor supply is incompatible with our labor demands. Examples of possible Title I projects are as follows:

1. Developing personnel and programs to counsel and retrain agricultural and other workers moving to new areas and occupations.

2. Developing improved methods of survey, analysis and dissemination of information on employment opportunities and the training of personnel in these methods to promote manpower development and training.

3. Retraining of women with some college experience to fill semi-professional community positions.

4. Providing training for the unskilled to make them employable in community occupations and thus reduce skill obsolescence.

5. Presenting courses designed to develop subprofessional skills which will increasingly be in short supply, such as para-medical personnel, library technicians, and family service and neighborhood center personnel.

6. Beginning programs to identify and fill the employment needs of such special groups as the aged, disabled, and youth.

7. Providing training of sub-professional social work aides.

8. Development of institutes and programs for the orientation of community leaders, agency personnel, and industrial officials in intergroup relations to aid in the resolution of racial and ethnic differences.

II. Government and Community Development Services

A. Housing

Although housing developments and sub-divisions are mushrooming across the State, certain groups of our citizens--the aged and the economically distressed--still require attention. Many of that 40 percent of Palmetto families having incomes less than $3,000 per year lack adequate housing. The approximately 1,400 low-rent units in South Carolina cannot satisfy the growing demand. Furthermore, a related area--proper sewage disposal and water supply--needs community attention. Examples of possible Title I projects are as follows:

1. Holding seminars for community officials and leaders to explain methods of attaining sanitary water and sewage disposal; to reveal government help available for such projects; and to motivate cooperation across local lines of jurisdiction.

2. Present seminars to encourage local officials to institute programs of low-rent units where needed.

3. Providing consultation services to cities and towns in developing and securing housing programs.

B. Government

South Carolina's governmental apparatus for filling contemporary needs is inadequate. The State Constitution of 1895, unattuned to the present, requires prompt revision. Most of the 46 Palmetto counties lack the expertise, resources, and power to develop the range of social institutions demanded by today's society. Many municipal officials need training for their governmental duties. To help communities analyze themselves and consider the structure, administration, and function that they wish to have in operation is now obligatory. Examples of possible Title I projects are as follows:

1. Developing inter-county and regional cooperation in financing, organizing and supplying community services and projects.

2. Conducting community leadership programs on a regional basis to demonstrate the advantages of local government consolidation and reorganization.

3. Holding seminars to educate the citizenry to the need for revising the State Constitution of 1895.

4. Beginning training programs for South Carolina Government employees in the various aspects of their governmental duties to acquaint them with the latest techniques and procedures in administration.

5. Conduct action-directed research dealing with local and regional needs to develop strategies in upgrading the professional manpower in municipal and county governments.

6. Developing and conducting training programs for the urban specialist.

7. Providing adult education sessions focused on responsibilities of adult citizenship, participation in the electorate, and leadership at the local level.

8. Sponsoring seminars on the cluster of problems facing metropolitan areas and the feasible methods of solving them.

9. Offering an experimental program using video-tapes of live lectures and workshops to (a) interpret and explore recent criminal law legislation and court decisions, (b) develop guidelines for application of these laws in a variety of situations, and (c) communicate these to various law enforcement agencies throughout the State.

10. Conducting seminars to (1) improve communications between citizen and police officer, (2) give officers a better understanding of recent Supreme Court decisions, (3) teach command personnel the basic concepts of police personnel management, (4) help officers better understand the problem of juvenile delinquency by explaining the psychology and sociology of youth.

11. Providing courses and workshops for professional and technical personnel on the principles of building code regulations and code interpretation followed by courses in the management and functional aspects of building code enforcement.

12. Conduct training programs and seminars for magistrates of South Carolina toward standardization and uniformity in courtroom procedures and conduct of their office.

13. Establishment of urban action centers aimed at drawing the institution(s) and the community together to: (a) stimulate student and faculty investigation of urban problems; (b) to aid in developing leadership potential within the community to deal with complex and interrelated urban problems; (c) to increase the understanding of urban problems on the part of citizens and neighborhood groups; and (d) to develop through cooperative community efforts new ways to solve urban problems.

e. Transportation

Transportation is a statewide problem of increasing complexity. Three factors--population growth, larger motor vehicle registrations, and the continuing shift from an agrarian to an industrial economy--will further magnify our difficulties.

Between 1965 and 1985 South Carolina's population is expected to increase by about 1/3 to nearly 3,400,000; motor vehicle registration by 2/3 and annual vehicle miles of travel by 3/4. The expected population increase during the next 20 years will nearly equal the increase during the 50 year period from 1910 to 1960.

Growth in auto travel is also being accelerated by South Carolina's shift from an agrarian to an industrial economy. As total employment was increasing at a rate only slightly greater than population, non-agricultural employment more than doubled, while agricultural employment declined by nearly 3/4. From 1950 to 1960 the value of annual industrial products rose by nearly 100 percent. Some of the effects on highway travel caused by these changes are:

(1) The former agricultural worker--whether he maintains his rural residence and commutes to his job or moves to the city--is making much greater use of his automobile.

(2) As income increases, people have more money to spend for transportation.

(3) The expanding opportunity for attractive employment in South Carolina is conducive to accelerated growth in population and consequently travel.

Examples of possible Title I projects are as follows:

1. Pilot programs aimed at exploring the role institutions of higher education might play in improving transportation through community service and continuing education.

2. Beginning programs for local communities to assist them in coping with local traffic problems.

3. Conducting seminars to bring together the chairman and the department heads of the principal State agencies concerned with transportation--the Highway Department, the Ports Authority, and the Aeronautical Commission--to outline the need for an Inter-Agency Council on Transportation, to coordinate their efforts and to pool their resources so that the total transportation needs of the State are met.

4. Conducting workshops to develop specific planning and consultation procedures to ensure that more attention is paid to the related effects of highway construction, such as growth patterns, urban settings, urban traffic, and beautification.

D. Environmental Development

The increasing industrial growth of South Carolina is changing small towns into sprawling metropolitan areas and scattered industry into huge industrial complexes. Advanced technology coupled with an ever-increasing population has placed unprecedented stress upon the environment in which man lives. Examples of ecological and environmental projects which can be developed under Title I are:

1. Presenting seminars for community leaders and planners to devise and enact programs to correct such adverse environmental factors as air pollution, water pollution, and safety hazards.

2. Defining locations of need and conducting seminars to distribute data and study methods of pollution control for community officials and interested citizens.

3. Establishing demonstrations on conservation methods.

4. Conducting training programs for school science, social studies, and other teachers in the proper use of natural resources.

5. Offering seminars for municipal officials and community leaders to explain to them the basics for beginning slum clearance and zoning projects.

6. Training planners in socio-economic trends, population shifts and changing patterns for land use.

7. Conducting training programs for community leaders in developing community beautification projects, industrial site selection, use of soil conservation practices and management of private residential land areas.

8. Conducting workshops dealing with water quality standards and emergency treatment procedures for city engineers, utility managers, etc., within the State.

9. Preparation of a manual and presentation of a series of seminars regarding problems of the environment including housing, health, sanitation, and pollution in an effort to improve the quality of the environment.

10. Designing a film or series of seminars to encourage community leaders--business and political--to recognize the long-term benefits deriving from sound resource use.

11. Developing programs to stimulate citizen awareness, action, and participation in problems of environmental control facing the State.

III. Community Health and Recreation Services

A. Recreation

With the amount of leisure time increasing as the work week shortens, recreational needs are assuming an added significance. Having a moderate climate, abundant water, numerous beaches, extensive woodlands, and even a few mountains, South Carolina is a natural setting for enjoying this leisure. More development of our geographical endowment, however, is needed. For instance, only 42 of the 254 Palmetto municipalities have a department of recreation. And the Travel Division of the State Development Board has discovered that about half of the State's populace have never had a vacation. Examples of possible Title I projects are as follows:

1. Preparing personnel to disseminate information on beaufification of community areas and highways, and the development of recreation areas.

2. Holding seminars for community leaders and municipal officials to acquaint them with ways of planning and implementing organized recreational programs.

3. Stimulating the public to purchase and preserve some of our remaining primitive areas for purposes of conservation and recreation.

4. Inaugurating projects to develop qualified indigenous leaders to conduct programs designed to offer physical, moral, social, and cultural learning opportunities to youth from deprived areas.

5. Having study groups ascertain the recreational needs of such special groups as the disadvantaged, the aged and the disabled; then launch action programs to fill these deficiencies.

6. Conducting seminars to investigate new ways to support community recreation projects, disseminate the results, and motivate popular support for any resulting financial innovations.

7. Training recreational leaders.

8. Educating travel industry employers and employees on the characteristics of tourism in South Carolina; training South Carolina travel industry employees in techniques and methods of serving tourists more satisfactorily; providing information to public and private leaders about the travel industry.

B. Health

Problems of physical and mental health loom high in the State. South Carolina leads the nation in deaths due to coronary thrombosis in adults under 45 and our coastal region has the highest incidence of paralytic strokes. As air pollution worsens, the Palmetto toll from emphysema, chronic bronchitis, lung cancer rises. Although the State life expectancy is increasing, it still ranks among the lowest nationally. Examples of possible Title I projects are as follows:

1. Developing programs for use by such mass media as television, radio, and publications for dissemination of information on physical and mental health.

2. Orienting ministers, teachers, and community workers in the principles of physical and mental health.

3. Presenting training programs for community officials and workers in community problems of the aging, particularly where this population segment predominates.

4. Developing demonstration research projects on cooperation among university faculties and community and state officials in the development of sound local and regional programs of physical and mental health.

5. Inaugurating programs for the training and recruitment of additional personnel such as ward clerks, orderlies, psychiatric aids, porters, anesthetists, and medical record and supply clerks in medical and health facilities.

6. Conducting workshops in marriage counseling that focus upon psychological adjustment, emotional stability, and cultural mores.

7. Conducting workshops to upgrade the training of health education teachers.

8. Providing training for the personnel of health and social service agencies so that they may offer services for alcoholics and support treatment facilities.

9. Presenting a series of seminars, workshops, or courses to train teachers, ministers, and nurses in working with those who are mentally and emotionally disturbed.

10. Formulating a program to develop and present an educational program on the nature and effect of drug abuse.

11. Teaching mental health personnel about the organization and implementation of community health services and providing leadership and direction to professional mental health workers.

12. Conducting training programs for operators and prospective operators of foster care homes for the elderly.

13. Conducting seminars to determine ways of exploiting the strengths inherent in the region/area system for the better organization of health services.

Notice of adoption of the foregoing named priority problem areas and specific aspects thereof by the State Agency for Fiscal Year 1971 will be sent to the state's institutions of higher education as soon as approval is granted. Notification will be included of the establishment of October 30, 1970, as the closing date for program proposal submissions in order to qualify for first round consideration for FY 1971 funds.

Notice of Activation of Community Service and Continuing Education Programs developed as a result of FY 71 Funding will be forwarded to the Office of Education, Division of Adult Education Programs within fifteen days after approval of projects.

In developing this Annual Amendment attention has been given:

to the existence of other federally financed programs dealing with similar and other community problems in the State and coordination with those programs, particularly in determining priorities of problems.

To the resources of institutions of higher education especially relevant or adaptable to develop and carry out community service programs related to the community problems selected.

Budget for Administration and Program Costs for Fiscal Year 1971

The amount of federal funds requested in support of this statewide system of Community Service and Continuing Education programs is based upon Fiscal Year 1970 funding for South Carolina: $156,614. If the State's allotment for FY 1971 differs from that shown, amounts allotted to the three program areas will be in the same proportion to total federal funds granted for program costs. Administration funding would remain the same.

Program

Priority List of Major Community Problems in South Carolina Budgeted According to Major Category to Provide Maximum Flexibility for Developing Projects of Optimum Promise

		Federal Funds	Matching Funds	Total
I.	Community Economic and Human Resource Development Services	$55,314	$31,000	$86,314
II.	Government and Community Development Services	55,200	31,000	86,200
III.	Community Health and Recreation Services	21,100	13,107	34,207
IV.	Administration	25,000	3,200	28,200
GRAND TOTALS		$156,614	$78,307	$234,921

Anticipated Budget

Administration	Federal Funds	Matching Funds	Total
Personnel Services			
Dean, Implementing Agency	$ 0	$ 1,800	$1,800
Title I Coordinator (½ time)	7,200		7,200
Research Assistant	6,300		6,300
Secretary (½ time)	2,500		2,500
Travel (Staff & State Advisory Council)	2,000		2,000
Communications	400	200	600
Audit Costs	900		900
Printing, Stationery and other Supplies	700	300	1,000
State-wide Survey of Problem Areas Relating to Title I	5,000		5,000
Rent		900	900
TOTALS	$25,000	$3,200	$28,200

ADDENDUM

Many of the fine proposals to Title I are eligible for funding under a variety of Federal grant programs. Because of the small amount of funds Title I receives in comparison to the ample funding of other Federal projects, the South Carolina State Agency is employing ever increasing scrutiny to these programs which may be eligible under other programs. In the future one of the criteria to be used in eliminating proposals will be the likelihood of funding from other sources.

We at the State Agency sincerely hope that faculty at the state's institutions of higher education will remain enthusiastic about community service and continuing education programs in spite of the extreme shortage of funds.

Towards that goal, we have compiled a summary of selected federal programs having an impact upon the same areas of concern as Title I. For a complete listing of federal programs, please refer to the Catalog of Federal Assistance Programs produced by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

We hope, however, that you will find this brief summation useful, and that some institutions may be able to locate alternative funding for their projects.

The summary is divided into six classifications of community problems:

1. Education at all Levels
2. Environment
3. Law Enforcement
4. Mental and Physical Health
5. Problems of Particular Age Groups
6. Urban Development

AC00851?

EDUCATION AT ALL LEVELS

Training Teachers for the Handicapped

Legislation: Grants for Teaching in the Education of the Handicapped, 20 U.S.C. 611; Title V Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Health Construction Act of 1963, 20 U.S.C. 618.

Nature and Purpose: To improve the quality and increase the supply of educational personnel trained to work with handicapped children. Grants are made to state educational agencies, colleges, and universities for the development and improvement of such training programs. The program also provides undergraduate, graduate, and in-service training for persons working or planning to work with the handicapped. Special grants are awarded to colleges and universities for training programs for workers in areas of physical education and recreation for handicapped children.

How to Apply: Institutions of higher education wishing to apply for grants should obtain written guidelines from:

Division of Training Programs
Bureau of Education for the Handicapped
Office of Education
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Washington, D.C. 20202

Cooperative Educational Research Program

Legislation: Cooperative Research Act, 20 U.S.C. 331a, as amended.

Nature and Purpose: To advance education at all levels by broadening the scope of educational research. Through grants and contracts, the program supports a wide variety of research, surveys, and demonstration projects for the purpose of expanding knowledge about the learning process, developing promising educational programs and methods, sustaining educational researchers carrying out various types of activities, and disseminating information about research efforts to educators and the public. Matching funds are required but in no specific percentage.

How to Apply: Colleges and universities alone or in cooperation with state education agencies, local school districts, individuals, non-profit institutions, and/or private companies may apply to:

Research Analysis and Allocation Staff
Bureau of Research
U.S. Office of Education
Department of Helath, Education and Welfare
Washington, D. C. 20202

EDUCATION AT ALL LEVELS continued

School Desegregation - Technical Assistance and Training

Legislation: Title IV, Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. 2000c-2 to 2000c-4

Nature and Purpose: To provide assistance upon request to aid school systems with school desegregation problems. Assistance is provided by: (1) grants to school boards for in-service training or hiring advisory specialists; (2) grants and contracts with colleges and universities for short-term or regular-session institutes to train school personnel to deal effectively with desegregation problems; and (3) technical assistance rendered by State education departments, school desegregation consulting centers in universities and the Division of Equal Educational Opportunities.

How to Apply: Institutions of higher education and local school districts may apply for technical assistance and financial support by contacting:

Regional Office of Education
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
50 Seventh Street, N. E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30323

Teacher Corps

Legislation: Title V-B, Higher Education Act of 1965, 20 U.S.C. 1101, as amended.

Nature and Purpose: To improve the educational opportunities available to disadvantaged children and to encourage colleges and universities to broaden their educational program to prepare teachers to deal more effectively with these children. The program provides teams of teacher interns for supplementary teaching tasks in school districts where at least fifty percent of the pupils come from low-income families. Interns study at a nearby university and receive practical experience through work with local school officials and supervision by an experienced teacher. Corpsmen become employees of a local school district, which pays ten percent of their salaries. Teacher Corps grants to the local schools pay up to ninety percent of their salaries plus administrative costs. Grants to universities cover all tuition and administrative costs for graduate studies.

How to Apply: Any school district may apply if it has a school which meets the fifty percent ratio requirement. Colleges and universities or consortiums of institutions may apply for the graduate portion of the program by writing:

Community Affairs Branch, Teacher Corps
Bureau of Educational Personnel Development
U. S. Office of Education
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Washington, D. C. 20202

EDUCATION AT ALL LEVELS continued

Teacher Fellowships and Training

Legislation: Title V, Education Professions Development Act and Higher Education Act of 1965, 20 U.S.C. 1117 and 1119.

Nature and Purpose: To improve the quality of elementary and secondary education by strengthening qualifications of teachers and other educational personnel, including those working in preschool programs and post-secondary vocational schools. Grants are awarded to colleges, universities, state and local educational agencies or a combination of these organizations to conduct institutes and graduate fellowship programs. Institutes may be summer projects, part-time in-service training, pre-service programs or virtually any other type of training program for educational personnel of all kinds. Trainees receive academic year stipends, plus dependency allowances, from the participating institutions.

How to Apply: Educational agencies or institutions wishing to conduct graduate fellowship programs and institutes should apply to:

Bureau of Educational Personnel Developme
U. S. Office of Education
Department of Health, Education, and Welf
Washington, D. C. 20202

Vocational Education Research and Training

Legislation: Title I, Vocational Education Act of 1963, as amended, 20 U.S.C. 35c(c).

Nature and Purpose: Supports research and training projects designed to provide young people, especially those from economically depressed situations, with the basic knowledge and skills vital to successful work careers. Among supported activities are institutes to upgrade the capabilities of vocational education teachers and administrators and a variety of research and development efforts ranging from pilot studies to comprehensive research and development centers.

How to Apply: Colleges and universities, state educational agencies, public or nonprofit private research agencies and local educational institutions are eligible for grants. For information contact:

Division of Comprehensive and Vocational Education Research
Bureau of Research
U. S. Office of Education
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Washington, D. C. 20202

PROBLEMS OF PARTICULAR AGE GROUPS

Aging - Community Planning, Services, and Training

Legislation: Title III, Older Americans Act of 1965, 42 U.S.C. 3021-3025.

Nature and Purpose: To help States expand services and opportunities for older persons and help fund State agencies on aging. The States support projects to: (1) plan and coordinate programs for older persons; (2) demonstrate programs and activities which have proven effective; (3) provide specialized short-term training for those planning to work with older persons; and (4) establish or expand direct services, such as multi-purpose senior centers, counseling, special transportation, recreation and education, and other services to meet the needs and problems of older persons.

How to Apply: Public or nonprofit private organizations may apply for grants under any of the above categories. Federal support is limited to three years, the aim being to develop services which will continue to operate after Federal support is terminated. The applicant must contribute twenty-five percent of project costs the first year. For information contact:

Intragency Council on Aging
2414 Bull Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Aging - Training

Legislation: Title V, Older Americans Act of 1965, 42 U.S.C. 3041-3043

Nature and Purpose: (1) To develop and maintain an adequate supply of personnel trained for professional, technical, and other specialized services in aging and related fields. (2) To provide continuing education for personnel already in the field. Training grants and contracts are made for the support of teaching personnel; traineeships; short courses, training institutes, and conferences; and development of curricula for training in aging.

How to Apply: Any public or private nonprofit organization (except federal agencies) engaged in activities relating to aging may apply for grants or contracts. Applications, which are reviewed by a Technical Review Committee and the Commissioner on Aging, should be submitted to:

Training Grants Branch
Administration on Aging
Social and Rehabilitation Service
U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Washington, D. C. 202021

PROBLEMS OF PARTICULAR AGE GROUPS continued

Child Welfare Training

Legislation: Title IV, Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. 626.

Nature and Purpose: To provide a pool of trained personnel for child welfare work and to help institutions of higher education expand and strengthen their educational resources to train more such personnel. Grants are made for traineeships, short-term courses, institutional development.

How to Apply: Public or other nonprofit institutions of higher learning may obtain further information from:

Children's Bureau
Social and Rehabilitation Service
U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Washington, D. C. 20201

Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control

Legislation: Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act of 1968, 42 U.S.C. 3801-3890.

Nature and Purpose: To help states and local communities to improve their juvenile justice and aid systems and to provide diagnostic, therapeutic, rehabilitative, and preventive services to delinquent and pre-delinquent youth. Grants, technical assistance, and information services are authorized in the following areas: planning comprehensive anti-delinquency programs; providing rehabilitative services; implementing community-based preventive services, and training professional personnel for youth work.

Office of Juvenile Delinquency
Social and Rehabilitation Service
U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Washington, D. C. 20201

PROBLEMS OF PARTICULAR AGE GROUPS continued

Manpower Development and Training

Legislation: Title II-B, Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, 42 U.S.C. 257.

Nature and Purpose: To train unemployed and underemployed people to help them enter or re-enter the job market or to upgrade their abilities. The required training is often at a lower level than a college or university would be qualified to offer. However, certain programs such as retraining for registered nurses, training of practical nurses and radiologic technicians, and on-the-job training for under-employed persons in certain fields have been carried out very successfully by institutions of higher education.

How to Apply: Colleges and universities can get more information from their local office of the South Carolina Employment Commission or by writing to:

Division of Manpower Development and Training
Bureau of Adult, Vocational, and Library Programs
Office of Education
Washington, D. C. 20202

ENVIRONMENT

Air Pollution - Training and Fellowships

Legislation: Title I, Air Quality Act of 1967, 42 U.S.C., 1857-1857L.

Nature and Purpose: Training grants are awarded to universities and other academic institutions to help them conduct graduate level training programs in an effort to increase the overall supply of trained air pollution control personnel. Fellowship grants are available to individual trainees. Short course training for personnel already in the field is also supported.

How to Apply: For further information, institutions of higher education should write:

National Air Pollution Control Administration
U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
801 North Randolph Street
Arlington, Virginia 22203

ENVIRONMENT continued

Housing and Urban Environmental Health

Legislation: Title III, Public Health Service Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 241 and 246.

Nature and Purpose: To develop solutions to a wide variety of environmental problems including housing, recreation, sanitation, non-occupational injury, and rat control. Research grants are made to stimulate improved approaches to problems in the urban environment and training and fellowship grants are available for academic graduate programs. Technical assistance is provided and short-term training courses covering the activities are conducted in Cincinnati, Ohio, and various field locations.

How to Apply: Academic, public, and other nonprofit institutions may apply for grants and technical assistance. Training courses are provided for professional personnel involved in the various aspects of housing and urban environmental health. Requests for further information or grant application kits should be submitted to:

Regional Health Director
U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
50 Seventh Street, N. E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30323

Solid Wastes - Financial Assistance

Legislation: Title II, Solid Waste Disposal Act, 42 U.S.C. 3251-3259, as amended.

Nature and Purpose: To develop new, improved, and economical methods of collection, storage, treatment, utilization, reduction, processing, or final disposal of solid wastes through research grants. Graduate level instruction in solid wastes programs is also supported through training grants providing equipment, supplies, tuitions, and stipends.

How to Apply: Colleges and universities may request application kits from:

National Center for Urban and Industrial Health
Public Health Service
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Washington, D. C. 20201

ENVIRONMENT continued

Water Pollution Control - Training Grants and Research Fellowships

Legislation: Federal Water Pollution Control Act, 33 U.S.C. 466, as amended.

Nature and Purpose: To increase substantially the number and quality of water pollution control personnel. Institutions are given partial support to establish, expand, or improve training in the practice, administration, research, or teaching of water pollution control. Research fellowships provide support for highly qualified individuals pursuing advanced degrees in disciplines leading to careers in the field.

How to Apply: Any qualified individual is eligible for a research fellowship. Colleges, universities, technical institutes, and other educational organizations may apply for grants by contacting:

Training Grants Branch
Federal Water Pollution Control Administration
U. S. Department of the Interior
Washington, D. C. 20240

LAW ENFORCEMENT

Law Enforcement Assistance - Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs - Training

Legislation: Reorganization Plan, Nov. 1, 1968: Federal Register, Vol. 33, No. 71, April 1, 1968.

Nature and Purpose: To strengthen control of the illicit distribution and abuse of narcotics and dangerous drugs. This is to be done through a variety of training programs designed to acquaint appropriate non-federal professional and enforcement personnel with the following aspects of the problem:

1. Physical security procedures involved in the legitimate distribution of drug products.
2. Techniques of qualitative and quantitative drug analysis for evidential purposes.
3. Techniques of the conduct of drug investigation.
4. Pharmacology, socio-psychological aspects of drug abuse and drug education.

How to Apply: College deans, administrative personnel, and security officers of any junior college, community college, or university may apply for training programs appropriate for their area of interest. Also eligible are pharmaceutical industry personnel, governmental crime laboratory technicians and forensic chemists, and law enforcement officials. For further information contact:

Office of Training
Chief, State and Local Law Enforcement Division
Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs
1405 Eye Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20005

LAW ENFORCEMENT continued

Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs - Public Education

Legislation: Reorganization Plan, Nov. 1, 1968: Federal Register, Vol. 33, No. 71, April 1, 1968.

Nature and Purpose: To assist interested institutions and groups in establishing educational programs on drug abuse. Beneficiaries of such programs should be those who have or may be inclined to use, misuse, or abuse drugs. The Bureau will act in an advisory capacity suggesting various approaches to the problem and offering technical expertise and information on available resources.

How to Apply: Any service, social, professional, educational, religious, or similar organization interested in initiating a Drug Abuse Educational Program may apply to:

Assistant Director for Science and Education
Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs
1405 Eye Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20005

Safe Streets and Crime Control

Legislation: Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, P.L. 90-351.

Nature and Purpose: To encourage, conduct, and support research and development in all aspects of law enforcement and criminal justice. The program offers grants, contracts and doctoral or post-doctoral fellowships.

How to Apply: Interested individuals or institutions should contact:

Mr. Carl Reasonover
Planning and Grants Division
Governor's Office
915 Main Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

MENTAL AND PHYSICAL HEALTH

Health Training

Legislation: Title V, Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. - 701.

Nature and Purpose: To train personnel for health care and related services for mothers and children particularly mentally retarded and multiply-handicapped children. Programs providing undergraduate training receive special attention. Grants support professional training of physicians, nurses, pedodontists, audiologists, physical and occupational therapists, social workers, psychologists, speech pathologists, and nonmedical administrators.

How to Apply: Public or nonprofit private institutions of higher education may submit grant applications to:

Children's Bureau
Social and Rehabilitation Service
U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Washington, D. C. 20201

Partnership for Health

Legislation: Comprehensive Health Planning and Public Health Service Amendments of 1966; Partnership for Health Amendments of 1967, 42 U.S.C. 246.

Nature and Purpose: To assist Public and nonprofit private organizations in training, studies, and demonstrations leading to more effective comprehensive health planning. Highest priority for project grants is given to training activities that promise to increase most immediately the supply of health planners and the skills of individuals working in closely related fields.

How to Apply: Public or nonprofit private organizations may submit grant applications to:

Regional Health Director
U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
50 Seventh Street, N. E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30323

URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Model Cities

Legislation: Title I, Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 3301.

Nature and Purpose: To provide financial and technical assistance to enable cities to improve their physical and social environment. Cities utilize and coordinate existing Federal grant-in-aid programs, state, local, and private resources and involve neighborhood residents in planning and executing comprehensive five-year city development programs. In general, the federal government provides eighty percent of the cost of planning, development, and administration of approved programs and subordinate projects or activities.

How to Apply: Municipalities of all sizes are eligible. Dates for filing applications are announced periodically by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. For further information contact:

Assistant Secretary for Model Cities and
Governmental Relations
Department of Housing and Urban Development
Washington, D. C. 20410

Urban Mass Transportation Research, Development, and Demonstration

Legislation: Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, as amended, 49 U.S.C. 1601.

Nature and Purpose: To assist in reducing urban transportation needs, improving mass transportation service, and meeting total urban transportation needs at minimum cost. Grants to universities may combine research support with training of persons for research or employment in this field.

How to Apply: Public bodies, universities, nonprofit and other organizations and individuals with research capabilities in urban transportation are eligible for grants. For information contact:

Administrator
Urban Mass Transportation Administration
U. S. Department of Transportation
Washington, D. C. 20591

URBAN DEVELOPMENT continued

Urban Mass Transportation Research and Training

Legislation: Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, as amended, 49 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.

Nature and Purpose: To support research, development and demonstration projects; technical studies; university research and training in the urban transportation field. The program provides one hundred percent of eligible costs of university research and training and two-thirds of the cost of technical studies conducted by states and local public bodies.

How to Apply: Public or private nonprofit agencies are eligible for research, development, and demonstration grants, states and local public bodies for technical studies grants, and institutions of higher eudcation for university research and training grants. For information contact:

Division of System Research and Development
Office of Urban Transportation Development and Liaison
Department of Housing and Urban Development
Washington, D. C. 20410

Urban Renewal Demonstration

Legislation: Housing Act of 1954, as amended 42 U.S.C. 1452a.

Nature and Purpose: To foster projects to serve as guides to communities in preventing and eliminating slums and blight. Grants cover up to ninety percent of the cost of developing and testing innovative method and technique and the full cost of writing and publishing reports on results. Priority is given proposals which promise to improve methods or act as guides for other communities.

How to Apply: Public bodies or nonprofit organizations legally authorized to undertake demonstration projects, to contract with the federal government for funds for such pruposes, and prepared to supervise such activities are eligible. Other interested public or private agencies may participate through the contracting organization. For information write:

ERIC Clearinghouse
AUG 10 1970
on Adult Education

Director, Office of Urban Technology and Research
Department of Housing and Urban Development
Washington, D. C. 20410